Attached is a memorandum from on a 2 December conversation he had with Mr. Greg Rushford of the House Select Committee Staff. I think it will be of interest to you all.

George A. Carver, Jr.

George A. Carver, Jr.

D/OCI/NIO

cc: Mr. Duckett Mr. Proctor Mr. Lehman

5 Dec 1975

FORM 101 USE PREVIOUS 5-75 101 EDITIONS

GACarver, Jr./kes
Distribution
Original - Breckinridge
cys - As indicated above
1 - D/NIO Chrono
2 - HSC File
1 - RI

Date

NIO # 25 64-75

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

☆ GPO: 1974 O - 535-857

UNCLASSIFIED

FORM NO. 237

Use previous editions

24X4	1

SECRET

2 December 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Session with Mr. Greg Rushford, Member of the Staff, House Select Committee on Intelligence

- 1. I met with Mr. Rushford at the Rayburn Building today at his request.
- 2. Mr. Rushford began by making some general observations about the mission of the Select Committee. He then alluded to what I believe he called the "myth" that the Board of National Estimates had been abolished because it was not amenable to political pressures, and in the belief that the NIO structure would be more responsive to the interests of policymakers. I told him that I did not know why the Board of National Estimates had been abolished and that he would have to ask James Schlesinger that question. I alluded to various things which had been said about the Board, e.g., that its product was unread and irrevelant to the needs of policymakers, that its output was not sharp and meant all things to all people, etc. I said that Schlesinger at one point had made it known to the Board that he had taken over his job with two questions: Whether the NIE should be preserved as an art form and whether the Board of National Estimates should be preserved as an institution. He said he had come to an affirmative answer with respect to the art form, but the question of the Board was still open. I remarked that I did not believe that the question was still open at that time. As far as the NIO structure was concerned, I told him that I had never been the subject of pressure from anybody to do anything. I said that I could not speak for my colleagues, but that as far as I was aware, that was true of them as well. I stated that we were professionals and that our stock in trade was credibility. we lost that there would be nothing left. I said that both the DCI and the D/DCI/NIO had repeatedly expressed such sentiments.

E2,	, I	MPDET
Cl	Ву	

25X41

SECRET



case, take a footnote, and then subside. I made particular reference in this context to representatives of the Air Force. Mr. Rushford asked me if I knew General Keegan. I said that I did, but only in the USIB context. I said that I did not see how any Air Force intelligence chief could be fully objective. During this discussion, I noted that it was not just in the Defense Department that departmental interests had an impact on intelligence judgments. I also acknowledged that we were all human, and subject to human fallibility.

9. Mr. Rushford stated (whether as his view or as a rapporteur I do not remember) that intelligence positions were often taken because of the known views of a superior on the particular issue. He cited as an example Secretary McNamara, implying that intelligence types fell into line with whatever was agreeable to the known views of the Secretary.

National Intelligence Officer for Latin America

5